Studies in Sāmkhya (III)
Author(s): J. A. B. van Buitenen
Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 77, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1957), pp. 88-107
Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/594919
Accessed: 10/09/2010 15:39

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aos.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society.*

http://www.jstor.org

STUDIES IN SĀMKHYA (III) *

J. A. B. van Buitenen
University of Chicago

SATTVA

Among the classical guṇas, *sattva, rajas* and *tamas,* the first, though in many respects the most mysterious one, has most readily been taken for granted in its classical function. Senart has shown the cosmologic origin of *rajas;* [1] and, although the same has never been done for *tamas,* this concept has always been understood in a much more "total" sense than that of 'spiritual insensibility.' *Sattva,* on the contrary, with its seeming transparency of meaning and lack of Vedic background, was easily accepted as a more advanced abstraction conveying the concept of all that is good in the spirit and the world, with no other cosmological content than was lent to it by its original "psychological" or "moral" function.

At first sight there seems to be little doubt that the three terms of the triad belong together intimately. This does not prevent that occasionally we meet them in pairs: *rajas* and *tamas, sattva* and *tamas,* but not, as far as I can see, *sattva* and *rajas;* there is also another pair, *tapas* and *tamas.* Sometimes *rajas* occurs alone. *Tamas* forms also part of a different set of four: *viparyaya, aśakti, tuṣṭi* and *siddhi,* the first of which, *viparyaya* or "ignorance," comprises the five subdivisions *tamas, moha, mahāmoha, tāmiśra* and *andhatāmiśra.*[2] Likewise *sattva* occurs alone, in a great variety of meanings: in an older period it was more or less synonymous with *buddhi,* and there are occasions where *sattva* even represents the "material" and is directly opposed to *kṣetrajña.* These meanings of *sattva* occur in contexts which evidently are part of proto-Sāṃkhyan doctrines; nonetheless they are usually sharply distinguished from *sattva* 'first guṇa' without an attempt to justify this distinction historically. Other functions of *sattva* seem to be still further removed: 'excellence,' 'being, creature, thing,' 'character,' such usages as in *bodhisattva* etc.

Often, and especially by those who are prone to rationalize the Sāṃkhya, stress is laid on the abstract nature of *sattva,* which in their view compares favorably with more primitive terms like *rajas* and *tamas.* Indeed, *-tva* is an abstracting and conceptualizing suffix, and *sat* itself is not infrequently regarded as one of the most admirably abstract concepts of early Indian thought—although *sattva* is only rarely derived from this *sat* 'the being One, Being,' but more usually from a *sat* rendered "good" (which is however more accurately "strictly observing, meticulously exact, punctilious"), and accordingly *sattva* is translated as "goodness."

I believe that in dealing with *sattva* scholars have started from the wrong end of the development, as they have done in the case of *ahaṃkāra.* Without considering how far the classical Sāṃkhya of the Kārikā was representative of contemporaneous Sāṃkhya doctrines, let alone of the many theories the Kārikā presupposes, they were ready to accept the concepts of the later system as their criteria; as in the case of *ahaṃkāra* they may have been misled by the comparatively late appearance of *sattva* as the first guṇa and the fixed sense which it has as this guṇa from the early occurrences onwards. One result of this classicism was the acceptance of *sattva* and the other guṇas as factors only conditioning the individual soul's *buddhi,* their cosmological function being looked upon either as secondary or as superseded.[3] Senart, in his study of *rajas,* reacted against this aprioristic view, but as far as the cosmic origin of *sattva* was concerned confined himself to a tentative suggestion, while against his entire argument grave objections can be raised. Przyluski started where Senart had left off, but he confused the issue with his hazardous speculations.

In the two preceding studies which have ap-

* See *JAOS,* LXXVI (1956), pp. 153 ff.; LXXVII (1957), pp. 15 ff.

[1] Emile Senart, "Rajas et la théorie indienne des trois guṇas," *JAs.* 11me série, tome VI (1915).

[2] Sāṃkhyakārikā 47.

[3] Cf. e.g. E. H. Johnston, *Early Sāṃkhya* (London, 1937), p. 38.

peared in this JOURNAL,[4] the writer has tried to show that the proto-Sāṃkhyan texts have preserved vestigial evidence of the ancient evolutionary function of the guṇas, memories of which where perpetuated in the syncretistic *ahaṃkāra* doctrine of the Kārikā. We mentioned in passing [5] that we understood by "guṇas" a triad in which *rajas* was a term, which later came to be called three guṇas, and which did not NECESSARILY comprise at its origin the other two guṇas *sattva* and *tamas*. We saw that the evidence has been preserved in the oldest stratum of the Mokṣadharma and was there soon misunderstood and corrupted, and we concluded that these evolutionary "guṇas" must have been ancient; finally we suggested that their final disappearance was caused by the greater appeal of the cosmic theory which inventorized, and later evolved, the world by five elements, *ākāśa*, wind, fire, water and earth.

We shall start our inquiry into the origins of *sattva* with an inquiry into the origins of the evolutionary triad called "guṇas." We have found that this evolutionary triad is called "*bhāvas*" in the oldest portions of the Mokṣadharma in a creation account where the *buddhi*, under the influence of or with the assistance of the guṇas, evolves into three successive phases of being or becoming, *bhāvas*, viz. *manas*, senses and elements.[6] If we should try to go beyond the epic evidence to search for corresponding doctrines or accounts, we should have to turn to the upaniṣads; when we do so, we find we are not entirely without suggestive clues, but it is immediately clear that we shall have to reorient ourselves to some extent.

This reorientation when we pass from the earliest post-Vedic evidence to the upaniṣads is always necessary and always difficult. Seldom do we find the concepts of the "epic age" in the same form in the "Vedic age," or rather should we substitute "milieu" for age, for chronological priority of Vedic to post-Vedic notions is not necessarily a fact. On the other hand, there are so many points of contact that some sort of continuity cannot be denied; still in many cases it is hazardous or even impossible to derive "later" concepts from the upaniṣads, i. e. those upaniṣads that are strictly speaking Vedic. Rather, we should look for certain basic patterns which underlie doctrines of both milieux and not concentrate too much on the literal contents of these patterns, in the sense that every term should have its direct counterpart, or the correspondence of the entire triad must collapse. In many cases it may be presumed fruitfully that the philosophoumena of the epic do not derive directly from those of the Vedic upaniṣads and the preceding Vedic literature, but that in both we have developments, parallel or divergent, of a more original set of patterns that have been elaborated upon in different milieux according to the demands and the mentality of each. This does not have to mean that the history of certain concepts or groups of concepts escapes all reconstruction, nor that this reconstruction should be wholly conjectural. But we shall have to guard against too simple explanations and too glib generalizations: for, although there is a distinct tendency in Indian thought to proceed from the simple to the elaborate, there is also a tendency from the comprehensive to the specialized. There is a multivalency in more ancient thought which, without ever being wholly lost, gives way to more precise thought construction, and to emphasize a posteriori certain definite valencies in earlier thought is therefore not always justifiable.

Since Oltramare [7] and Oldenberg [8] we look for the prototypes of the guṇas in the upaniṣads of the Śvetāśvataras and of the Chandogas. A well-known passage in ŚvetUp. 4, 5 describes an "unborn male" who copulates with an "unborn female" and produces red, white and black creatures. This is clearly a reference—in my opinion a corrective one—to similarly colored products described in the creation account of ChUp. 6, where an original being called *sat* produces *tejas*, *āpas* and *annam* which are the red, white and black forms (*rūpāṇi*) of the world to be. It must however be noted that Indian commentatorial tradition is not of the same opinion. Śaṅkara [9] and Rāmā-

[4] "Studies in Sāṃkhya (I), An Old Text Reconstituted," *JAOS*, LXXVI (1956), pp. 153 ff.; and "do., II, Ahaṃkāra," *JAOS*, LXXVII (1957), pp. 15 ff.

[5] *JAOS*, LXXVI, p. 157[9].

[6] MBh. 12, 187 etc. as reconstructed *JAOS*, LXXVI (1956), pp. 153 ff.

[7] Paul Oltramare, *L'histoire des idées théosophiques dans l'Inde*, vol. I (Paris, 1906), p. 240.

[8] Hermann Oldenberg, *Die Lehre der Upaniṣaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus* (Göttingen, 1923[2]), p. 186.

[9] ChUpBhāṣya 6, 2, 3; Sūtrabhāṣya 2, 3, 10 (Poona ed., p. 272) beginning *nanv itarāpi śrutir.*

nuja[10] both explain these three "elements" of ChUp. 6 to be used *pradarśanārtham,* representing the entire series of the five elements, if not the other principles from *Mahat* down as well. But important is at least that Sāṃkhyan connections are being recognized. To my knowledge there is only one epic passage where the identity of the three forms of ChUp. 6 and the three guṇas of Sāṃkhya is explicitly stated. MBh. 12, 291, 45 after a description of the guṇas continues:

śuklalohitakṛṣṇāni rūpāṇy etāni trīṇi tu /
sarvāṇy etāni rūpāṇi jānīhi prākṛtāni vai //

Several points are worth noting: the use of *rūpāṇi* proves that the reference is indeed to ChUp. 6; the emphasis on their *prākṛta* nature is curious but significant; and finally the reversion of the order red-white, not a transposition for metrical reasons,[11] is of some importance.

Starting from these correspondences—for whatever they are worth—between the triad of the guṇas and the triad of *rūpas,* Senart tried to demonstrate that the original function of the guṇas was cosmic, and that these guṇas originally referred to the three worlds. To the first view I subscribe, with the added support of the epical *bhāva* doctrine, but with the reservation that the three guṇas as a triad had this cosmic origin and not necessarily the three guṇas *sattva, rajas* and *tamas* by themselves. On the second view that the guṇas or *rūpas* of the ChUp. account represent the three worlds a few remarks must be made.

Although there is no doubt that from Vedic times on the three worlds, heaven, atmosphere and earth played their part in cosmogony, there is also clear evidence of a creation myth where world creation was not effected in space but in time. This creation in time was described concretely as the succession of the three seasons, summer, rains and harvest, in the course of which crop is produced to sustain creation. This is the significance of the equivalence: *sa eṣa saṃvatsaraḥ prajāpatiḥ* 'the Creator is the Year.'[12] We have touched on the meaning of BĀUp. 1, 2 in another context,[13] and we must return to it now to enlarge on the myth of hunger and food. In this cosmogonic myth several accounts are brought together which we must distinguish before we can discern what holds them together.

This cosmogony begins: "Nothing at all was here at first. This world was enveloped by death alone, that is by hunger. For death is starvation. He conceived the desire: 'I may be myself.'" The formula with which the cosmogony begins is stereotyped. The "nothing-at-all" is, very concretely, death, and this death is specified as starvation, so that death is not an end but a beginning, the nothing-at-all not a nothing-MORE but a nothing-YET. His creation starts with a desire, a *manas,*[14] and the nothing-yet becomes someone, an *ātmanvin* or 'a being with a self to it,' on the strength of his desire. Thereafter creation is related in three different accounts.

Account I reads: "He went about chanting. Of his chanting the waters came to be. (He exclaimed:) 'When I just chanted *kam* came to be.' This is the mysterious meaning of *arka*: *kam* befalls him who knows this mysterious meaning of *arka. Arka* equals the waters. That which was the reed of the waters, that conglomerated and became the earth. On it he exhausted himself. Of his exhausting himself, heating up himself, the essence *tejas* came forth, that is fire." Whatever may be the truth in his other remarks, Ruben is right in pointing out that "chanting is what the rain-makers and brahmins did."[15] But Ruben does not bring out the force of this point. For Starvation is really up to making rain and from his charms the rains did come. The charms work and become rain, are therefore rain: *āpo vā arkaḥ.* These rains swell the rivers and the flotsam of reed borne down-stream forms the earth floating on the water. On this earth the Creator exhausts himself and secretes fire; the sexual symbolism is thinly dis-

[10] Śrībhāṣya 2, 3, 1-14; cf. also my note in *Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha* (Poona, 1956), translation 17.

[11] One might, however, mention the rule that in a compound the longer word follows the shorter one; but we shall see that there are excellent reasons why the second term of the triad, *rajas,* acquired the red color.

[12] E. g. ŚatBr. 10, 2, 4, 1; 2, 6, 1; 4, 2, 1; 11, 1, 1, 1; PraśnUp. 1, 9; MaitrUp. 6, 15 *sa kālaḥ sakalaḥ / sakalasya* (sc. *brahmaṇo*) *vā etad rūpaṃ yat saṃvatsaraḥ / saṃvatsarāt khalv imāḥ prajāḥ prajāyante .. saṃvatsaro vai prajāpatiḥ / kālo ' nnaṃ brahmanīḍam ātmā cety.*

[13] *JAOS,* LXXVII (1957), p. 18.

[14] So already ṚV. 10, 129, 4.

[15] Walter Ruben, *Die Philosophen der Upaniṣaden* (Bern, 1947), p. 123: ". . . sang Hymnen (wie die primitiven Regenmacher und die Brahmanen taten) und schuf damit die Wasser."

guised: from the heat of exhaustion the *rasa* of *tejas* (both words for the semen virile) pours forth. We remark that creation here is effected in three seasonal phases: starvation personified conjures up rain; earth conglomerates and takes shape; fire originates. That the waters are the rains is evident from the floating reed which covers monsoon torrents. The rains swell the rivers. Without rain, which makes new life possible, there is famine and starvation; hence starvation must start creation by making rain, to produce crop and sustain life.

Account II starts from this tripartite creation and inventorizes the world under three aspects. The Creator splits himself in three: himself, sun and wind. The same tripartition is also expressed in "this *prāṇa* is made triple," where an equivalence *ātman* = *prāṇa* "that which makes one a living being" is implicit. A different creation myth, that of the Cosmic Person who constitutes the world in different parts of his body,[16] is forced into the pattern of tripartition, but not very successfully. At the end there is a return to the theme of I: *sa eṣo 'psu pratiṣṭhitaḥ* 'he is based firmly upon the waters.'

Account III departs from the original desire: "I may be myself," and continues: "He desired: "There be a second self to myself." Through this desire he copulated with Vāc, and that which was his semen became the year: for before then there had been no year. He bore it for as long as a year; after that long a time he delivered it. When it was born he opened his mouth to it: he emitted the sound *bhāṇ* and that sound became Vāc. He thought: "If I use my will upon it, I shall make a little food." So he created with this self of himself by Vāc all this, whatever there is, the hymns of *ṛk, yajuḥ* and *sāman, chandas,* the sacrifices, men and animals. Whatever he created he started to swallow." This "swallowing" is no doubt a variation of what elsewhere is called "entering into it,"[17] whereby the self-creation of the original being is completed, and is directly comparable to *sat*'s entering into the three *rūpas* as a living being when food has been produced. The Creator, so to speak, takes food and thereby starts the life of creation, which is himself.

What holds these three accounts together so that they could be incorporated in this series of mystic instructions on and about the *aśvamedha*? It is just this creation of food by a process in three phases, stages or parts, which is the theme of account I where the esoteric significance of *arka* was explained by exploiting the homonymy of *arka* 'charm' and *arka* 'fire' and a mystic meaning of *kam* 'water' but also 'bliss.' This multivalent *arka* is the sacrificial fire which is mysteriously equivalent to the *aśvamedha* by being the death of the sacrificial horse—but a death to end all death, for he who knows this equivalence is safe from double-death.[18]

For anyone who lives in India the coming of the rains is the turning-point of the year. After the elemental force of summer, sapping the resources of man and nature, transforming the plains into bleak wasteland, the onset of the monsoon is the dawn of life and creation. In the nothingness of the sky white clouds appear, in the dry beds of almost forgotten rivers torrents come down with a vital force that is at once frightening and reassuring. Whatever the more remote associations of the primordial waters one hears about—the embryonic water in which the child is born, or the surface of the unconsciousness from which consciousness emerges—in India at least the waters of creation should represent principally the rains and the swelling rivers. The negation of existence before the rains come, real starvation, gives way to a new vitality in man and nature; fodder is plentiful, the plains are green, the crop is harvested. Life starts anew. Clearly the thinkers behind this starvation and creation myth are not simply worshippers of hunger, as Ruben calls them.[19] Their myth is, as so often, a realistic account of the realities of their life. And one may wonder if the annual miracle of creation through seasonal change was not the main inspiration of the creation myths where an original being creates the world in three stages, from the fierce promise of summer through the fecundating waters to the abundance of harvest whose regions are sky, atmosphere and land. For when we now return to the creation account of ChUp. 6, we see that the tripartition of *tejas, āpas* and *annam* tallies exactly

[16] ṚV. 10, 90 etc.

[17] ChUp. 6, 3, 2-3; TaittUp. 2, 6; see below.

[18] BĀUp. 1, 2, 7 *apa punarmṛtyuṃ jayati nainaṃ mṛtyur āpnoti mṛtyur asyātmā bhavati devatānām eko bhavati.*

[19] *Philosophen*, p. 123 "Verehrer des Hungers."

with the yearly succession of seasons. The evolution which takes place in time can be understood much more easily in the terms of successive seasonal changes than in terms of the three cosmic layers in which no priority is so immediately given as in the succession of summer, rains and harvest. The term *annam* in Uddālaka's account is not just *pṛthivīlakṣaṇam*, as Śaṅkara has it [20]—who, as we saw, equates these three phases with the classical five elements—, but just what it means: crop, rice, FOOD. The text leaves us in no doubt: *tasmād yatra kva ca varṣati tad eva bhūyiṣṭham annaṃ bhavati / adbhya eva tad adhy annādyaṃ jāyate.*[21] And just as Starvation, after creating the Year, starts to create with it " his second self," that is the world, his self-creation, so *sat* starts to create the world (separating out names-and-forms) after it has entered into *tejas*, the waters and food.[22]

We wondered if the evolution theories did not start from a vision of creation as SEASONAL creation, in three stages which corresponded to the seasons or their functions and effects and through them with the regions where they are supposed to operate. It is intriguing that in the earliest portions of the Mokṣadharma the rival creation doctrine of the five elements is not yet an evolution theory.

It was necessary to discourse on the ideas behind the three *rūpas* of the creation account in ChUp. 6 in order to appreciate Senart's view that *tejas, āpas* and *annam* represent the three worlds and are prototypes of the three guṇas *sattva, rajas* and *tamas.* The eminent French scholar has collected materials to show that *rajas* has the meaning " atmosphere ' rather than ' dust, dirt,' but his results might now have to be reconsidered in the light of Burrow's recent study on the etymology of *rajas.*[23] Burrow, dissatisfied with the traditional etymology of *rajas* which presupposes a meaning " dark space," proposes, with a wealth of arguments, two new derivations for two homonyms *rajas,* one in the sense of " space, expanse, intermediate space, sky," from *raj-* ' to stretch, extend,' and one in the sense of " dust, dirt " from *raj- / lag-* ' to cling to.' But he subscribes to the view that the guṇa *rajas* is to be explained from the latter sense " dirt, etc." Probably this view is founded on his opinion that *rajas* ' (intermediate) space ' ceases to occur after Ṛg- and Atharvaveda; but this point is debatable. Granting even that in some cases it is difficult to decide whether *rajas* means " atmosphere " or " dust whirling in the sky," there are a number of passages where the first meaning is clearly the right one. For instance BĀUp. 5, 14, 3 *athāsyā etad eva turīyaṃ darśataṃ padaṃ parorajā ya eṣa tapati .. parorajā iti sarvam u hy evaiṣa raja upary upari tapati*; when we consider that the first three padas are, inter alia, represented by *bhūmir antarikṣaṃ dyauḥ* (14, 1), the interpretation of *parorajas* ' beyond cosmic space ' is clearly indicated. In BĀUp. 6, 3, 6 a meditation on *bhargo devasya dhīmahi* reads: *madhu naktam utoṣasaḥ / madhumat pārthivaṃ rajaḥ / madhu dyaur astu naḥ pitā / bhuvaḥ svāhā,* where *pārthivaṃ rajas* means either " the region of earth," or " above the earth." Similarly *rajas* in MāhānārUp. 5, 8 and 12:

yat pṛthivyā rajaḥ svam antarikṣe virodasī /
imās tad āpo varuṇaḥ punātv aghamarṣaṇaḥ //
rajo bhūmis tvamām rodayasva pravadanti dhīrāḥ /

Such expressions cannot be separated from e. g. ṚV. 7, 100, 5d *kṣayantam asya rajasaḥ parāke* and similar formulae. The same explanation of *rajas* is often more appropriate in such compounds as *virajas-* etc. than the usual renderings are; e. g. MBh. 12, 203, 34

ete bhāvā jagat sarvaṃ bhavanti sacarācaram /
śritā virajasaṃ devaṃ yam āhuḥ paramaṃ
padam //

" These forms of being comprise the entire world of mobile and immobile beings; they rest on the god who is transcendent, whom they call the highest point." [24]

I have found no evidence for the assumption that the guṇa *rajas* derives from *rajas* " dirt " with a shift of meaning " dirt " → " moral defilement," → cosmic principle as Burrow assumes: " this rajas in the sense of spiritual defilement forms one of the guṇas of the Sāṃkhya system, at

[20] To whom Senart refers; the passage is ChUp. 6, 2, 4 *tā* (sc. *āpas*) *annam asṛjanta pṛthivīlakṣaṇam / pārthivaṃ hy annam.*

[21] ChUp. 6, 2, 6.

[22] On the self-creation of *sat* see below.

[23] T. Burrow, Sanskrit *rájas, BSOAS,* XII, p. 645.

[24] Cf. also MuṇḍUp. 2, 2, 9 *hiraṇmaye pare kośe virajaṃ brahma niṣkalam.*

first a purely psychological division, later elevated to the status of cosmogonical principles." [25] To be sure, there is ample evidence that *rajas* was given a psychological function and thus interpreted as *rāga*, from *raj-*, "passionate attachment,' which in its turn was linked up with another *rāga*, from another *raj-*, "red color," but the psychological function developed out of the cosmological one. In this respect the epic *bhāva* doctrine is instructive: we see that the evolutionary "guṇas" effect external changes of the *buddhi*, into *manas*, senses and elements; the internal changes of sensations and emotions follow. When abiding in the manas, the *buddhi* enjoys happiness; when abiding in the senses, the buddhi is subject to the conflicting emotions of sensual life. Another distinction of *nivṛtti* and *pravṛtti* is related to the *mano-* and *indriyabhāva*.[26]

It is true that in the *bhāva* doctrine the thinkers have already gone a long way towards an individualization of cosmic creation processes; but that such processes lie at the root of the epic *bhāva* cosmogony cannot be denied. We concede that the direct evidence for the evolutionary and, by extension, cosmogonic origin of the guṇas is slender; but the evidence for an original psychological function and a later elevation "to the status of cosmogonical principles" is non-existent.

To sum up: Burrow's new views on *rajas*, for all the clarity they have brought to other uses of the term, do not invalidate Senart's view that *rajas*, as guṇa, originally had the meaning "atmosphere." The fact that this older *rajas* fell into desuetude—though we may differ about the "date"—certainly contributed to the reinterpretation of this guṇa as "dust, dirt, defilement," though other factors, the devaluation of created life and the forces that sustain it, played a more important role.

Although the correspondence *rajas* ⌢ *āpas*, proposed by Senart, is not necessarily disproved if the other correspondences, *tejas* ⌢ *sattva* and *annam* ⌢ *tamas* are shown to be untenable, yet the cumulative evidence of all three correspondences would surely carry more conviction; unfortunately, these correspondences are far from clear. Certainly an equivalence or correspondence of *rajas* and *āpas* has much to commend itself: both occupy the same place in their triads; *rajas* 'intermediate space, sky, atmosphere' is the region of the "waters," i. e. the clouds which rain and swell the rivers; the color white (*śukla-*, but one can also think of the "resplendent waters") ascribed to the waters would fit the clouds of *rajas* very well.

A similar correspondence *tamas* ⌢ *annam* is much less commendable. *Annam* is called black, and though we can think of the dark wet soil at the time of sowing, it is quite possible that the black color has nothing to do with *annam* as such but is simply the third in a triad of colors existing independently as a classification scheme which has been brought into connection with the triad of *rūpas* because to some extent they tallied: *tejas* red, *āpas* white, and therefore *annam* black. But this does not have to mean that therefore *annam* stands for *tamas*. It seems to me that too much has been made of these colors in the reconstruction of the history of the guṇas. The fact that later on we find the guṇas likened to the white, red and black threads (in this order) woven into a piece of cloth does not mean that these colors derive directly from ChUp. 6. For all we know red-white-black may have been a popular color scheme in clothes [27] and the colors of the strands or threads (*guṇas*) may have stuck to the threads when these came to be used as a symbol of the universe into which three constituents are woven. The supposed connection of white with *rajas* was at any rate soon dropped and, probably under the pressure of the reinterpretation of *rajas* as *rāga* 'passion' combined with the supposedly identical *rāga* 'red color,' red was henceforth the color of *rajas*, while the higher guṇa, no longer connected with the concrete fire of sun etc. but with light and brightness generally, came to be described as white. For other uses to which this triad of colors was put we may compare the teaching of Aruṇa, the father of the Uddālaka of ChUp. 6, who discerned five *rūpas* in the sun itself: red, white, black, ultrablack and the throbbing in the centre of the sun: [28] evidently this pentad is built on the triad, and it shows that the triad was not at all fixed in its connection. Besides there are other series of colors in which also *harita* and *piṅgala* appear.[29]

[25] O. c., p. 469.

[26] The same adhyāya, MBh. 12, 187, 50.

[27] Ruben, *Philosophen*, p. 164 "gerade diese drei Farben aber sind in alter Technik der Keramik and Webekunst üblich und in primitiven Mythologien belegt."

[28] ChUp. 3, 1-5.

[29] E. g. ChUp. 8, 6, 1; BĀUp. 4, 3, 20.

It is difficult, further, to show the cosmic origin of *tamas*.[30] The ancient *tamas*, which is the primeval night of nothingness from which creation appears, cannot really be quoted, because there is a vast difference in the creative roles of both notions of *tamas*. To be sure, MaitrUp. 5, 2 makes an attempt[31] to combine the guṇa *tamas* with the primeval *tamas*, but the combination is very forced indeed. Moreover, the fact that in the systematized guṇa doctrine *rajas* and *tamas* belong together and the hypothesis that granted the equivalence of *rajas* and *āpas*, *tamas* and *annam* must therefore also be equivalent, do not really follow, as Senart maintains. *Sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* are really disparate terms, and an hypothesis based on their original coherence begs the question.

Neither *sattva* nor *rajas* in their central senses—even if one takes *rajas* 'dirt'—form a contrast with *tamas* 'darkness.' But there is evidence of a *tamas* in a more easily understandable opposition to *tapas*, darkness—light ∽ ignorance—knowledge. MBh. 12, 209 (B. 216), 16 reads:

evaṃ hi tapasā yuktam arkavat tamasaḥ param /
trailokyaprakṛtir dehī tapasā taṃ maheśvaram //
tapo hy adhiṣṭhitaṃ devais tapoghnam asurair tamaḥ //
etad devāsurair guptaṃ tad āhur jñānalakṣaṇam //

The first śloka, relatively lucid in the vulgate,[32] is obscure in the critical edition, but clearly the transcendence of the soul (which is here the underlying cause of the universe) over this universe is compared with that of *tapas*, represented by the sun, over *tamas*; the cause of the soul's transcendence is *tapas* "for *tapas* is ruled by the gods, whereas *tamas*, which destroys *tapas*, is ruled by the asuras; that which is preserved by gods and asuras alike—apparently something higher than *tapas*—is called knowledge." This last knowledge is also called *tapas* in 210 (B. 217),

trailokyaṃ tapasā vyāptam antarbhūtena bhāsvatā/
sūryaś ca candramāś caiva bhāsatas tapasā divi //
pratāpas tapaso jñānaṃ loke saṃśabditaṃ tapaḥ /
rajastamoghnaṃ yat karma tapasas tat svalakṣaṇam //

"the universe is pervaded by *tapas* which shines from within; sun and moon in the sky borrow their light from *tapas*. The light of *tapas* is knowledge which is therefore known in the world as '*tapas*.' The function of destroying *rajas* and *tamas* is typical of *tapas*." It is clear from the choice of words that both passages somehow belong together. The introduction of *rajas* in the last line is quite unexpected, but in this passage as above in 209 the pair *tapas*—*tamas* is simply equated with the triad *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* with which both texts are mainly concerned: on 209, 17 quoted above follows in similar terms:

sattvaṃ rajas tamaś ceti devāsuraguṇān viduḥ /
sattvaṃ devaguṇaṃ vidyād itarāv āsurau guṇau //

If *tapas*, or rather the *pratāpa* of *tapas*, may have claims to an absolute character by being the redemptive knowledge in ch. 210, its connection with the guṇas brings it down to a lower level; so in 209, 19 it is said that there is something higher than *sattva-rajas-tamas* = *tapas-tamas*:

brahma tat paramaṃ vedyam amṛtaṃ jyotir akṣaram /
ye vidur bhāvitātmānas te yānti paramāṃ gatim //

Generally, it would seem to me, *tapas* is higher up in the hierarchy of notions than the *sattva* with which it is juxtaposed here. Surely the pair *tapas-tamas* intrudes somewhat in our context, but it is clear that we here have another attempt to amalgamate more or less parallel series.

These incidental correspondences between *tapas* and *sattva* hardly provides a basis for an equivalence *tapas* = *sattva*, apart from the fact that it would entail an equivalence *tamas* = *rajas-tamas*, for which however much more can be said.[33] Even less of a foundation has the equivalence *sattva* = *tejas* which Senart suggests tentatively.[34] The symmetry and synonymy of the triads of the guṇas and the triad of the *rūpas* in ChUp. 6 are indeed far from being "perfectly established." A cor-

[30] I. e. *tamas* as the third guṇa.

[31] *Tamo vā idam agra āsīt* etc.

[32] This reads in d. *tamaso 'nte maheśvaraḥ*, so that the translation runs: "for the (*manas* of st. 15), when possessed of *tapas*, shines forth like the sun beyond *tamas*: the embodied soul, whose prakṛti is constituted by the universe, is the supreme lord when the *tamas* has been passed"; for the "end of *tamas*," cf. ChUp. 7, 26, 2 quoted below.

[33] See below.

[34] Emile Senart, "La théorie des guṇas et la Chāndogya Upaniṣad," in *Etudes asiatiques* (= jubilee volume of *BEFEO*; Paris, 1925), p. 287.

respondence *rajas* ⌒ *tapas* is possible, certainly; a correspondence *tamas* ⌒ *annam* has no other ground than the black color which suits *tamas* but is attributed to *annam*; now to assume an equivalence *sattva* = *tejas* because of the " perfect symmetry and synonymy " of the other terms is really taking too much for granted.

The equivalence of *sattva* and *tejas*, which Senart suggests only tentatively, is taken for proved by Przyluski. This scholar accepts [35] without question the identity of the three guṇas with the three cosmic worlds of sky, atmosphere and earth as deduced by Senart from the supposed symmetry of guṇas and *rūpas*. He then compares ChUp. 2, 23, 3-4 where Prajāpati, by using his creative power of *tapas* on the worlds, produces the three Vedas, and by using his *tapas* on the Vedas produces the sounds *bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ* and *svaḥ*. This of course is a variant of the story where Prajāpati creates the worlds by articulating these three sounds, with the addition of the well-known *tapas* of other creation accounts. But Przyluski, operating with the principle of " symmetry " which by now has become a law, concludes from this ChUp. 2 text to a series *tapas* + three worlds; then since there is a series *sat* + three *rūpas* and a series of three guṇas, he substitutes everything for everything else and arrives at a series *tapas—tejas—rajas—tamas*, the only virtue of which seems to be that now we have four neuters in *-as*. Departing from the " guṇas " *tejas* etc. but failing to find a clear line of development from these " cosmic guṇas " to the classical guṇas, he turns for an explanation to the Iranian Ohrmazd, Mithra and Ahriman, to explain which he turns to the Babylonian cosmology of heaven, earth and sea. These remote analogies occasion an etymology of *guṇa* ⌒ Aw. *gaona* " ' poil ' et par extension ' couleur de poil, couleur,' " Such methods of course fail to carry any conviction.

With this criticism of the attempts by two eminent scholars to reconstruct the early history of the guṇas we do not mean to convey that the *rūpas* of ChUp. 6 and the guṇas have nothing to do with each other,[36] but that we should be very careful when we discover corresponding triadic patterns to insist that each and every term has its correspondent. Better results might be had when we study the guṇas themselves, while constantly keeping in mind the triadic pattern to which they belong at one stage and to which they need not have belonged originally. The multivalency particularly of *sattva* even in Sāṃkhyan contexts leads us to expect that the study of this concept, covering a wider field and so providing more evidence, may help us to clarify at least part of the problem more satisfactorily.

In dealing with the many meanings of *sattva* we shall confine ourselves mainly to those which the term has in proto-Sāṃkhyan contexts. As far as I am able to judge these meanings are 1. *sattva* as the material counterpart of the *kṣetrajña*; 2. as the *buddhi*; 3. as a *bhāva* of the *buddhi*; 4. as a state of well-being amounting to release; 5. as the first of the three guṇas.

It is a curious fact that in one Mokṣadharma text no less than three of the above meanings of *sattva* occur, the first three. The text is 12, 187 = 239-240, according to Frauwallner [37] the *epische Grundform* of Sāṃkhya, though I would hesitate to subscribe to this scholar's view that our text is *klar und folgerichtig*.

Sattva as counterpart of *kṣetrajña* and sum-total of world creation occurs in the following stanzas: :

sattvakṣetrajñayor etad antaraṃ paśya sūkṣmayoḥ /
sṛjate tu guṇān eka eko na sṛjate guṇān // 187, 37

" understand that *sattva* and *kṣetrajña*, which are both subtle principles, differ in this that the former creates the elements and the latter does not."

na guṇā vidur ātmānaṃ sa guṇān vetti sarvaśaḥ /
paridraṣṭā guṇānāṃ ca saṃsraṣṭā manyate sadā // 40

" the elements do not know the *ātman*, but he knows the elements always; he is the observer of the elements, but always imagines that he is their creator."

sṛjate hi guṇān sattvaṃ kṣetrajñaḥ paripaśyati /
saṃprayogas [38] *tayor eṣa sattvakṣetrajñayor dhruvaḥ //* 42

[35] J. Przyluski, "La théorie des guṇa," *BSOAS*, VI (1931), pp. 25 ff.; and "La loi de symétrie dans la Chāndogya-Upaniṣad," *BSOAS*, V, esp. pp. 491 ff.

[36] The sequel will show how near our own studies will lead us to Senart's conclusions.

[37] Erich Frauwallner, *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*, Band I (Salzburg, 1953), ch. 6, p. 292.

[38] A well-attested variant reads *viprayogaḥ* 'difference.'

" for the *sattva* creates the elements whereas the *kṣetrajña* looks on: this is the invariable relationship between *sattva* and *kṣetrajña*."

āśrayo nāsti sattvasya kṣetrajñasya ca kaścana /
sattvaṃ manaḥ saṃsṛjati na guṇān vai kadācana // 43

" there is no further cause of either *sattva* or *kṣetrajña*;[39] *sattva* creates the *manas* . . ."[40]

Compare also 228, 31cd:

sattvaṃ kṣetrajña ity etad dvayam apy anudarśitam /

A similar meaning of *sattva* as comprising the whole of creation is found in the Sāṃkya of Arāḍa as described by Aśvaghoṣa in his Buddhacarita[41] 12, 17:

prakṛtiś ca vikāraś ca janma mṛtyur jaraiva ca /
tat tāvat sattvam ity uktam sthirasattva parehi tat //

" evolvent and evolute, birth, old age and death sum up *sattva*: so it is taught; go beyond it, O constant One."[42]

The following stanzas 18-19 describe *prakṛti* and *vikāra*, whereupon 20 continues:

asya kṣetrasya vijñānāt kṣetrajña iti saṃjñi ca /

where *asya kṣetrasya* evidently resumes *sattva*. The term recurs in 23:

ajñānaṃ karma tṛṣṇā ca jñeyāḥ saṃsārahetavaḥ /
sthito 'smin tritaye jantus tat sattvaṃ nātivartate //

" ignorance, act and desire are known as the causes of continued existence; so long as man takes his stand on these three he will not overcome the above *sattva*."

The same *sattva* we recognize in Carakasaṃhitā,[43] śarīrasthāna 1, 47:

bhavās teṣāṃ samudayo nirīśaḥ sattvasaṃjñakaḥ /
kartā bhoktā na sa pumān iti kecid vyavasthitāḥ //

" one school maintains these principles and their origination, without a divine creator, which is called *sattva*; as well as a *puruṣa* who is neither agent nor recipient." This can only mean that *sattva* is the cause of the elements and as such opposed to the *kṣetrajña* who is not really involved in creation and its effects.

Another meaning of *sattva* lies near that of *buddhi*. It is already announced in KaṭhUp. 6 (= 2, 3), 7:

indriyebhyaḥ paraṃ mano manasaḥ sattvam uttamam /
sattvād adhi mahān ātmā mahato 'vyaktam uttamam //

" beyond the senses is the *manas*, beyond the *manas* the *sattva*, beyond the *sattva* the great *ātman*, beyond the great one the unevolved." One is instantly reminded of BhG. 3, 42 where the hierarchy reads: senses—*manas*—*buddhi*—*ātman*, and of the *bhāva* doctrine where the *puruṣādhisthitā buddhiḥ* evolves *manas* and senses, as well as of in the same chapter (187, 37 quoted above) the statement that *sattva* creates the *manas*. The same correspondence, if not actually equivalence, of *sattva* and *buddhi* is evident in MBh. 12, 203, 33

manaḥ sattvaguṇaṃ prāhuḥ sattvam avyaktajaṃ tathā /

" *manaḥ* is a product of the *sattva*, the *sattva* derives from the *avyakta*."

How are we to account for these different functions of *sattva* (1) as creator and creation, (2) as the *buddhi*? They are not really different: primary is the function of *buddhi* which is the evolvent of the " psychical " organs *manas* and senses and the material elements, which together constitute world creation. In these early forms of Sāṃkhya creation does not necessarily start from a higher principle than the *buddhi*,[44] e. g. *avyakta*,

[39] I would prefer this rendering to that of Deussen-Strauss, *Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhāratam* (Leipzig, 1906), in B. 194, 44; p. 184: "das Sattvam und der Kṣetrajña haben keine gemeinschaftliche Basis."

[40] The fourth pāda is obviously corrupt; we expect: " *sattva* creates the *manas* and the further evolutes," as in 37; cf. Belvalkar's note on 187, 43.

[41] Edited and translated by E. H. Johnston, 2 vols. (Calcutta, 1933-36).

[42] On *sthirasattva*, see below.

[43] Ed. V. K. Dâtâr (Bombay, 1922).

[44] I do not propose to enter here into a discussion of *buddhi/manas* etc., which deserve a separate monograph; but on the whole it is clear that both terms reflect the original " self-recognition " and " desire " to

pradhāna or *prakṛti*, but from the *buddhi* itself; nor has the *ahaṃkāra* yet taken over the evolutionary functions of the *buddhi.* As the *buddhi sattva* is indeed creation and thus the 'material' counterpart of the unaffected *kṣetrajña.* It is just this creatorship of the *buddhi* which is the theme of the entire chapter 187, not only in the *bhāva* doctrine or in the ślokas on *sattva* quoted above, but also in odd ślokas such as 16-17:

guṇān nenīyate buddhir buddhir evendriyāṇy api /
manaḥṣaṣṭhāni sarvāṇi buddhyabhāve kuto guṇāḥ //
iti tanmayam evaitat sarvaṃ sthāvarajaṅgamam /
pralīyate codbhavati tasmān nirdiśyate tathā //

"the *buddhi* precedes the evolutes [45] completely: the *buddhi* alone precedes all five senses with the sixth sense *manas*: how could there be evolutes if the *buddhi* did not exist? Therefore this entire universe with mobile and immobile creatures is made of the *buddhi* (in which) it has its origin and its end; therefore it is thus described."

The approximation of *buddhi* and *sattva* is the result of the coalescence of parallel doctrines which listed these entities high up in their hierarchies of evolution, sometimes starting evolution from it, sometimes not. In one context this coalescence may have been more complete than in others. Interesting is the usage of a cumulative term in the Yogasūtrabhāṣya pointed out by Johnston: [46] *buddhisattva* in the sense of *buddhi*: this strikes us as a comprehensive formula summarizing the identical functions of both terms. Elsewhere however both principles stand side by side as in the late MBh. 12, 308, 103-4:

dvādaśas tv aparas tatra buddhir nāma guṇaḥ smṛtaḥ /
yena saṃśayapūrveṣu boddhavyeṣu vyavasyati //
atha dvādaśake tasmin sattvaṃ nāmāparo guṇaḥ /
mahāsattvo 'lpasattva vā jantur yenānumīyate //

"then there is a further element known, the twelfth one (sc. after 10 senses and 11th *manas*), called *buddhi,* by which the person decides about things to be known which could not be resolved by the preceding means of knowledge. Beyond this twelfth one there is a further element called *sattva,* by which a person is judged to be *mahāsattva* or *alpasattva.*" We shall discuss the suggested relation between °*sattva* and *sattva* as the element later on; our chief interest here is that the element *sattva* is listed between *buddhi* and *ahaṃkāra* and that it can only continue the above *sattva.*

In this connection Carakasaṃhitā, sūtrasthāna 1, 46 deserves mention:

sattvam ātmā śarīraṃ ca trayam etat tridaṇḍavat /
lokas tiṣṭhati saṃyogāt tatra sarvaṃ pratiṣṭhitam //
sa pumān cetanaṃ tac cādhikaraṇaṃ smṛtam /
vedasyāsya tadarthaṃ hi vedo 'yaṃ saṃprakāśitaḥ //

"*sattva,* the *ātman* and the body are a triad like a trident, by their combination the world exists: the universe is based upon it; it constitutes the *puruṣa,* which is the knowing principle: and that is the qualification for the Veda, for the Veda has been revealed for his sake." The commentator equates *sattvam* here with *manas* in a general sense, and Johnston suggests *cetanā* or *buddhi.*[47]

The MaitrUp. knows two *sattvas* besides the first guṇa which also occurs, and both are quoted in apparently ancient ślokas. MaitrUp. 6, 38 reads: *agnihotraṃ juhvāno lobhajālaṃ bhinatty ataḥ saṃmohaṃ chittvā na krodhān stunvānaḥ kāmam abhidhyāyamānas tataś caturjālaṃ brahmakośaṃ bhindad ataḥ paramākāśam atra hi saurasaumyāgneyasāttvikāni maṇḍalāni bhittvā tataḥ śuddhaḥ sattvāntarastham acalam acyutaṃ dhruvaṃ viṣṇusaṃjñitaṃ sarvāparaṃ dhāma satyakāmasarvajñatvasaṃyuktaṃ svatantraṃ caitanyaṃ sve mahimni tiṣṭhamānaṃ paśyati / atrodāharanti—*

ravimadhye sthitaḥ somaḥ somamadhye hutāśanaḥ /
tejomadhye sthitaṃ sattvaṃ sattvamadhye sthito 'cyutaḥ //

"while offering the *agnihotra,* he breaks through the net of greed; having torn through perplexity,

become a person or sat of the unreified creator who (which) was *asat* or *avyakta*; for a few remarks on this point see below.

[45] Note this meaning of guṇa; renderings like "product, element, evolute, constituent" are approximations: guṇa denotes all at once; the term deserves further study, cf. also Senart, "Rajas et la théorie indienne des trois guṇas"; Johnston, *Early Sāṃkhya,* p. 30.

[46] O. c., p. 50.

[47] O. c., p. 51.

not praising the forms of anger and concentrating on desire, he then pierces the fourfold whorl of *brahman* and thence into supreme space; in that whorl he breaks through (these four) concentric layers formed by sun, moon, fire and *sattva*, and then, being purified, beholds the one within *sattva*, immovable, indestructible, called Viṣṇu, all-highest splendor, the isolated spirit endowed with the power of having all his desires realized and with the power of omniscience, and abiding in his own transcendence.[48] On this they cite: " within the sun is moon, within the moon is fire, within the fire is *sattva*, within the *sattva* the Indestructible." Evidently a yoga process is described here. In *lobha, saṃmoha, krodha* and perhaps *kāma* we recognize functions of *rajas* and *tamas*. The *brahmakośa* is the flower-cup of the mystic lotus in the centre of which is a space surrounded by a whorl of four concentric layers of leaves; these four *maṇḍalas* are connected with sun etc. in a light symbolism that is typical of the speculations about the mystic lotus. *Sattva*, we note, is a higher principle than *tejas*, it is the last screen or the first covering, and when this innermost layer is pierced the highest spirit—who is a person—within the inner space is beheld in mystic contemplation.

MaitrUp. 4, 3 describes the *pratividhir bhūtātmanaḥ* " the rule by which to counter the *bhūtātman* "[49] and quotes:

tapasā prāpyate sattvaṃ sattvāt saṃprāpyate manaḥ /
manasaḥ prāpyate hy ātmā yam āptvā na nivartate //

" by the performance of *tapas* one reaches *sattva*, from *sattva* the *manas*, from *manas* the *ātman*, having attained which one does not return." This is apparently a different *sattva* which we can connect with the *sattva* of ChUp. 7, 26, 2: *āhāraśuddhau sattvaśuddhiḥ sattvaśuddhau dhruvā smṛtiḥ smṛtilambhe sarvagranthīnāṃ vipramokṣaḥ / tasmai mṛditakaṣāyāya tamasaḥ pāraṃ darśayati bhagavān sanatkumāraḥ* " when the taking of food has been purified, the *sattva* becomes pure; when *sattva* has been purified, the recollection is secure; when the recollection has been secured, all bonds will be loosened. Thus did the venerable Sanatkumāra show Nārada, cleansed of all impurity, the end of *tamas*." The *āhāraśuddhi* is surely the result of a special regulation in taking food, a *tapas*, and *smṛti* corresponds to *manas*. Interesting is the opposition of *tamas*, the darkness of ignorance and impurity. At a later point we shall try to narrow down the meaning which *sattva* has here; at this point it suffice to note the yogic association of the term.

Leaving aside for the moment the third meaning of *sattva* we distinguished, *sattva* as the first *bhāva* —the *manobhāva*—of the *buddhi*, and concentrating now on the fourth, *sattva* as a state of well-being tantamount to release, we will consider the following evidence. In the closest relation to the functions described above we meet the term in this meaning in such texts as MBh. 12, 245, 3:

pratirūpaṃ yathaivāpsu tāpaḥ sūryasya lakṣyate /
sattvavāṃs tu tathā sattvaṃ pratirūpaṃ prapaśyati /

" just as the light of the sun is seen reflected in water, so the one who is possessed of *sattva* sees the *sattva* reflected "; and 4:

tāni sūkṣmāni sattvasthā vimuktāni śarīrataḥ /
svena (tattvena) tattvajñāḥ paśyanti niyatendriyāḥ //

" those who are firm in *sattva* and know the *tattvas* see these subtle *tattvas* released from the body by virtue of their own (*tattva* or *sattva*) when they have subdued the senses." The *sattva* here appears as that subtle stuff of which release is made; it is transcendent and must be attained by a process of yoga. Important is the reflection of *sattva* which may be compared with the reflection of the soul in matter, the *abhimāna* strictly speaking; there is a plurality of *tattvas* which can exist apart from the body and apparently constitute the *sattva*.[50] But it is not the same as the soul, it is

[48] Cf. texts like ChUp. 8, 1, 1 *atha yad idam asmin brahmapure daharaṃ puṇḍarīkaṃ veśma daharo 'sminn antar ākāśaḥ / tasmin yad antas tad anveṣṭavyaṃ tad vāva vijijñāsitavyam . . . 5 etat satyaṃ brahmapuram* [" this fortress of brahman (= body creation) is real ": cf. note 72 below on *tat satyam*] *asmin kāmāḥ samāhitāḥ / eṣa ātmā . . satyakāmaḥ satyasaṃkalpaḥ.*

[49] " The embodied, elemental *ātman*," the material world.

[50] The subtle elements (*tattvāni*) may be compared both to the *sūkṣmaśarīra* and to such elements as *tejas* etc. in which the sat of ChUp. 6 primarily subsists. I should prefer to read *sattvena* for *tattvena*, though the distinction is very slight as the above remark shows.

the soul's state of release; nor yet is it the *buddhi*, but beyond it (cf. 8). But in a comparable passage *sattva* does to some extent correspond to the *buddhi*: 12, 238, 9-10:

hitvā tu sarvasaṃkalpān sattve cittaṃ niveśayet /
sattve cittaṃ samāveśya tataḥ kālaṃjaro bhavet //
cittaprasādena yatir jahāti hi śubhāśubham /
prasannātmātmani sthitvā sukham ānantyam aśnute //

"having given up all desires (a function of the *manas*) the yogin must bring the spirit in *sattva*; having brought the spirit in *sattva* he will become a *kālaṃjara* ascetic.[51] By virtue of the serenity of his spirit the yogin gives up both good and evil *karman*, and, with complete tranquillity abiding in the *ātman*, he attains bliss and infinitude." One may hesitate to equate *citta* with *manas* or with *buddhi*, but *buddhi* seems definitely preferable, for serenity is a quality of the *buddhi* rather than of the *manas*: *sattva* thus becomes the serenity itself, free from all disturbances. Similarly 205, 29:

tasmād ātmavatā varjyaṃ rajaś ca tama eva ca /
rajastamobhyāṃ nirmuktaṃ sattvaṃ nirmalatām iyāt //

"therefore the yogin must give up both *rajas* and *tamas*, so that his *sattva*, freed from *rajas* and *tamas*, becomes spotless."

In some of the above instances we may hesitate in deciding whether *sattva* is indeed the released state of the soul or the condition for release. Yet when we compare the unequivocal statements of later date that all three guṇas must be overcome if release is ever to be achieved, it is clear that the above instances convey a different position: emphasis is on the purification of *sattva*, not on the subduing of it. One thing becomes increasingly clear from the evidence marshalled above: the *sattva* which at certain times and in certain contexts shows distinct correspondences with the *buddhi* cannot be separated from the *sattva* which becomes associated with the guṇas *rajas* and *tamas*. Nor is this *sattva* an entirely "material" entity. An important consequence is that *sattva* on the one hand and *rajas* and *tamas* on the other hand do not belong to the same category altogether. Instructive is the quoted MaitrUp. 6, 38 where functions, later (or elsewhere) ascribed to *rajas* and *tamas* (*lobha, sammoha* etc.) appear as obstacles in a yogic process of integration in which the last and decisive step is to overcome *sattva*: but between these *rājasa* and *tāmasa* obstacles and *sattva* many other principles intervene. Interesting is also MBh. 12, 246, 9 ff. where the body is compared to a town in which the *buddhi* holds sway; the *manas* is the executive (*arthacintaka*), the senses are the people. In this town rage two virulent diseases, *rajas* and *tamas*, which undermine authority and drag *buddhi* and *manas* down to the level of the senses. *Sattva* is absent here, but it is undoubtedly represented by the *buddhi* as the transcendent authority. Similarly 217, 10-11:

ye tv evaṃ nābhijānanti rajomohaparāyaṇāḥ /
te kṛcchraṃ prāpya sīdanti buddhir †yeṣāṃ praṇaśyati //
buddhilābhe hi puruṣaḥ sarvaṃ nudati kilbiṣam /
vipāpmā labhate sattvaṃ sattvasthaḥ saṃprasīdati //

"those who do not know this, being absorbed in *rajas* and *tamas* (= *moha*), find misery and decline, (for) their *buddhi* decays.[52] When a person has gained the *buddhi*, he wipes off all impurity: being free from evil he gains *sattva* and as a *sattvastha* he is in a state of perfect serenity." Here again we notice how close *buddhi* and *sattva* are: *sattva* is the unaffected state of the *buddhi*, free from *rajas* and *tamas*. Similarly *rajas* and *tamas* appear in 206, 1:

**tamasā sādhyate moho *rajasā ca nararṣabha /*
krodhalobhau bhayaṃ darpa eteṣāṃ †sādhanāc chuciḥ //

"*moha* results from *tamas*, and wrath and greed, fear and conceit from *rajas*;[53] by subduing them[54] one becomes pure." And if *sattva* is described in 12 as *tamasi saṃsthitam*, just as *rajas* is *tamasi paryastam*, this does not put all of them in the same class, for *tamas* may be so opposed to both *sattva* and *rajas*. Elsewhere we have brought out

[51] Deussen-Strauss translate: "wird man [unerschütterlich wie] der Berg Kālañjara werden," but it seems preferable to read here a reference to theory and practice of yogins associated with this mountain or region.

[52] Belvalkar marks *yeṣām* doubtful; at any rate *teṣām* seems preferable.

[53] The editions, including Cr. Ed., read *rajasā . . . tamasā* which should be transposed.

[54] Belvalkar marks *sādhanāc* doubtful; I translate *sādanāc* from the variants.

the significance of the fact that in this adhyāya *rajas* is connected with the senses: this connection might on the part of *sattva* imply a similar connection with *buddhi* or *cetas,* which after the foregoing discussions has nothing remarkable.

Frequently one gets the impression that *rajas* and *tamas* form really ONE collective concept comprising between them all obstacles to release and so form together an antithesis to *sattva.* Helpful is a comparison with Arāḍa's Sāṃkhya. Some scholars have made a problem out of the fact that Aśvaghoṣa does not include the "guṇas" in his description, that means: the guṇas in the number, nomenclature, meaning and function they have in the Kārikā and in other "official" Sāṃkhya texts. But if we are to suspect Aśvaghoṣa of unfair dealing, so we should suspect the many authors of the Mokṣadharma who omit these guṇas. The guṇas in their classical functions obviously were not an invariable feature of a unitary Sāṃkhya "system." We have shown that the relation between *ahaṃkāra* and guṇas is secondary; *avyakta,* often the vehicle of the guṇas is mentioned in passing by Arāḍa and then forgotten: in fact its role in epical Sāṃkhya is far from universal. Besides, the introduction of the role of the guṇas as universal constituents is comparatively late. This does not mean that it was a late invention: we believe, and we have shown arguments, that the doctrine of the three guṇas as cosmic magnitudes —from which function they derive their character of constituents—and the doctrine of the prakṛtis originally were competing theories, and only in our oldest texts do we see them side by side, to be followed by the almost exclusive presence of the prakṛtis in various stages of development. Arāḍa, we note, adheres to the eight prakṛtis. Therefore the only situation where the absence of the guṇas might legitimately cause surprise and even suspicion would be with and around the *buddhi,* for just with the *buddhi* do the guṇas, in any function, have the most persistent connections. And there is it precisely that we find them. *Sattva,* we saw, appears as the sum-total of body and psyche, in other words as the *buddhi* and its creation, and includes the obstacles to release: *avidyā, karma,* desire (st. 23). But in the same stanza the punning vocative *sthirasattva* (cf. *mahāsattva, alpasattva* MBh. 12, 308, 104) shows that the author was aware of *sattva* in a sense related to the transcendent aspect of the *buddhi.*[55] These obstacles and opposites to the "transcendent," that is released, *buddhi* are further on summarized under *avidyā,* which is described in st. 33:

ity avidyāṃ hi vidvān ca pañcaparvāṃ samīhate /
tamo mohaṃ mahāmohaṃ tāmiśradvayam eva ca //

"the expert claims that ignorance is fivefold, viz. *tamas, moha, mahāmoha, tāmiśra* and *andhatāmiśra.*" These are the same five divisions that are enumerated in the Kārikā under *viparyaya* 'ignorance.' We note that all five are synonyms or near-synonyms of *tamas*: *moha* replaces *tamas* regularly. BhāgPur. 3, 20, 18 uses *mahātamas* for *mahāmoha.*[56] But we note also that in the subsequent description of these terms not only *tāmasa* qualities are summed up, but also typically *rājasa* ones, i. e. qualities etc. which in the doctrine of the three guṇas are classified not under *tamas* but under *rajas.*[57] In other words, side by side with the dual division of *rajas* and *tamas* we find one comprehensive complex of *tamas* which itself is again subdivided into five classes indicated by variations on the word *tamas.*

What, then, is the relation between *rajas* / *tamas* and the five-fold *tamas*? If we accept Senart's view, corroborated by epical evidence for such a function, that *rajas* started its career as a cosmological entity, and explain the later oblivion of that function partly from the early obsolence of *rajas* 'space, atmosphere' as Burrow has shown and its simultaneous reinterpretation as *rajas* 'dirt' combined with *rāga* 'passion,' it is easy to see how this *rajas,* which was from of old associated with the *buddhi,* came to be identified with some of the qualities so far listed under *tamas,* viz. *kāma, lobha, rāga* and *krodha, dveṣa.* Under this hypothesis we are able to account for all the different functions of *rajas* we have encountered. We may state the entire hypothesis as follows.

Rajas originally was a cosmic entity, "sky, atmosphere," between earth and sun/sky as the second in a triad of earth, atmosphere and heaven. These three worlds at one point came to be re-

---

[55] See below.

[56] In Viṣṇu Pur. 1, 6, 41 *tāmiśra* and *andhatāmiśra* are names of hells.

[57] Viz. in 12, 34 *mahāmohas tv asaṃmoha kāma ity eva gamyatām,* and 36 *tāmiśram iti cākrodha krodham evādhikurvate.*

garded as stages in a process of world creation, probably under the influence of speculations which described creation as a succession of seasons with sun/summer, atmosphere/clouds-rains, earth/harvest and also under the influence of the creation-by-formulation of the names and things *bhūḥ bhuvaḥ svaḥ*.[58] In circles which we may associate with the names Sāṃkhya and Yoga, where the principal interest was centered on the way to release which is implicit in any evolution theory of creation, the old conception of a cosmic person who creates the world as his body (a conception that also underlies the more "naturalistic" creation accounts as the self-creation of some original being) was developed according to the same triadic pattern, but with a more advanced and above all pronouncedly MICROCOSMIC aspect: this *puruṣa* created the world from his *buddhi* in three direct evolutions, *manas*, senses and elements. But more or less contemporaneously, perhaps a little later, the process of creation came to be described differently: the world had been inventoried under 7 or 8 principles, and this inventory itself became an evolution theory, though of a different pattern: the horizontal pattern of one being or cause which becomes three effects successively—the old triadic scheme—gave way to a vertical pattern where the first effects the second, the second the third etc. This pattern replaced the horizontal pattern almost completely: the reason was undoubtedly the greater flexibility of the vertical pattern which allowed the addition of new principles for which a need was felt. Here and there, especially around the creation of *manas*, senses and elements, the old triadic scheme persisted and upset the vertical order of descent in the doctrines of those who attempted to synthetize various theories, e. g. the author of the Kārikā; but the *buddhi* lost his function of sole creator though it retained the three "moods" that were the reflections of its three creations on its at first pure and unaffected self. Elsewhere in milieux, one may presume, where the vertical pattern of the seven or eight principles had first been developed, these affections of the *buddhi* (if that was how they called the same principle) were described in an entirely different manner: they distinguished a pure state of enlightenment, sometimes called *tapas*, which was in fact a state of release or from the point of view of creation a transcendent state, and three stages of increasing deterioration, *tuṣṭi, aśakti* and *viparyaya* or *avidyā*, of which the last stage, the complete opposite of enlightenment, was subdivided into five categories with names which are variations of the *tamas* that is occasionally met as the antithesis of *tapas* and *sattva*. The three "moods" of the *buddhi* in the more old-fashioned doctrine, once their basis in a tripartite creation had been given up, assimilated themselves to these four stages. The second term in their triad, *rajas*, which gradually must have been reinterpreted as "dirt, defilement, passion" when not only its old meaning "intermediate space" but also its function of cosmic factor of creation became obsolete, attracted those qualities etc. among the *tamas* complex which accorded well with its supposed passionate character: *rāga* etc. and its opposite *krodha* etc. To the third term, "*tamas*" or whatever they called the entity which once as "earth" corresponded to *rajas* 'atmosphere,' were left those qualities of "inaction, insensibility, stupefaction, unconsciousness" which accorded with its character of inanimate nature. Thus the *tamas* complex was reformed into a dual *rajas-tamas* complex in those milieux where memories of a triadic *buddhi* lingered; other circles, as that of Arāḍa, which remained untouched by the renovations of those who had just abandoned a position they had given up long before, continued with a single *tamas* complex.

This hypothesis may appear quite circumstantial but does not assume more than what, in different phases of our inquiry, we had fair to excellent reasons to accept. As far as I can see, it accounts for the known facts about *rajas*: its old function "atmosphere" which Senart has shown to be connected with the guṇa *rajas* and which must have had its place in a triad sky/atmosphere/earth, or summer/rains/harvest; the recurring connection of *rajas* with the senses and no such recorded connection of *tamas* with the senses; the function of *tamas* in the single *tamas* complex where it comprises typically *rājasa* elements; and the transition of *rajas* "atmosphere" to *rajas/rāga*. To be sure, the historical picture has become more and more complex, but this was only to be expected: if all the facts were known, our explanation would certainly be found to err on the side of simplicity rather than complexity. There must have existed

---

[58] In the Kālāgnirudra Up. however *rajas* appears in a series with *bhūrloka*, *sattva* with *antarikṣa*, *tamas* with *dyaurloka!*

scores and scores of more or less isolated little centers where parallel doctrines were being evolved out of a common source. Occasional meetings at pilgrimages and festivals, reports from other and remote *āśramas* brought by wandering ascetics, polemic encounters with other preachers must have resulted in a laborious process of partial renovation and conservation, more precise definitions of doctrines and eclecticism, readjustments of terminology etc. At this stage to credit these little centers with the name "schools" is to do them too much, or too little, honor. Among those who recognized one another's doctrines as related, normalization prevailed with all the inconsistencies and syncretism of which the final doctrines show traces. We had a glimpse of them when we discussed the Kārikā doctrine of *ahaṃkāra.* Most of the process must elude us necessarily, but we stand a better chance of recovering the little that is left by allowing for the greatest diversity, rather than the greatest uniformity of doctrine.

If we now return to *sattva,* we realize that the great diversity of its functions and meanings will also be due to a long process of doctrinal and terminological readjustments and maladjustments. Only in part can we account for them as stages of historical development of the concept. A concept so vaguely defined by the literal meaning of its name is likely to be used in increasingly different contexts. To force its functions into one line of evolution would be to simplify unreasonably. But we may attempt to show why just this *sattva* could acquire at times quite antithetical meanings.

We have suggested more than once that the evolution doctrine of the *buddhi* with the three "guṇas" and that of the *buddhi* with the *prakṛtis* were to some extent competing theories which after a probably long drawn process of amalgamation finally coalesced, though not invariably. Interesting is in this connection the description of a Sāṃkhya doctrine in MBh. 12, 290, 14 ff. Here a number of principles are enumerated as follows: *sattva* with ten guṇas (*daśaguṇaka*), *rajas* 9, *tamas* 8, *buddhi* 7, *manas* 6, *ether* 5, *buddhi* 4, *tamas* 3, *rajas* 2, *sattva* 1. It is not clear what is meant by *daśaguṇaka* etc., probably "ten-fold" somehow understood as "tenth" and implying the preceding nine and itself. But we find in this enumeration three clear series: 1. *sattva, rajas* and *tamas*; 2. *buddhi, manas,* ether; 3. *buddhi, tamas, rajas, sattva.* In other words, the *buddhi* heads two series: that of the *prakṛtis, buddhi, manas,* ether and the other elements, and that of the guṇa triad, while this triad also occurs by itself. In the sequel we find a rather desperate attempt to include as many series as were known to the author: sight-color: nose-smell: ear-sound: tongue-taste: body-touch: wind: ether: *moha*: *tamas*; *lobha*: riches; this series is not difficult to follow, with its side-by-side enumeration of the elements, the senses and the *viśeṣas,* which are followed significantly by *rajas* (represented by *lobha*) and *tamas* as the guṇas associated with senses and elements. But then follows confusion: strides: Viṣṇu; *bala*: Śakra; belly: fire (sc. *vaiśvānara*); goddess (= earth): waters: *tejas*: wind: ether: *mahat*: *buddhi*: *tamas*: *rajas*: *sattva*: *ātman*: *īśa*: Nārāyaṇa: *mokṣa,* which is syncretism at its worst. Then follow the lines:

jñātvā sattvayutaṃ dehaṃ vṛtaṃ ṣoḍaśabhir guṇaiḥ /
svabhāvaṃ cetanāṃ caiva jñātvā vai deham āśrite //
madhyastham ekam ātmānaṃ pāpaṃ yasmin na vidyate /
dvitīyaṃ karma vijñāya nṛpate viṣayaiṣiṇām //

"knowing that the body is possessed of *sattva* and enveloped by 16 guṇas, and that both *svabhāva* (prakṛti) and *cetanā* (buddhi) rest on the body, and that inside the body there is the one *ātman* in which no evil is found, and knowing secondly the *karman* of those who strive after the sense-objects, O lord.." To bring order here seems hopeless, but conspicuous are the uncertainty of the position of the triad vis-à-vis the 7 *prakṛtis* and the importance in the quoted ślokas of *sattva* which seems to sum up the 16 guṇas and is therefore the body as a whole—including *prakṛti* and *cetanā*—and that within which the one *ātman* resides untouched. Apparently the author or authors are at a loss how to combine the triad with the *prakṛtis* and probably also the last *sattva* with the guṇa *sattva*; it is tempting to seek the cause of the confusion in the fact that they knew the triad in a function also assumed by the *prakṛtis,* and *sattva* as the sum-total of creation and as the "*buddhi,*" very much in the sense in which we met it in MaitrUp. 6, 38.[59] The whole passage is a striking example

[59] The one *ātman,* which is in the middle of the body.

of the encounter of different doctrines and the failure of synthesis.

We passed by the third function of "*sattva*" as the first evolved *bhāva* of the *buddhi*, corresponding to *manas*. We have no unequivocal evidence that this *bhāva* is indeed equal to, or conditioned by a factor called *sattva*. We assumed it from the parallelism of what we have termed the external *bhāvas* (the second of which is *rajas*, the factor of the senses) and the internal *bhāvas*, *sattva-rajas-tamas*. Version B reads *sattva* where we would expect it: but since a copyist may have been struck by the same parallelism, I should cautiously prefer the non-committal variant *bhāvam* of Version A. That there is a triad of evolvent factors behind the three external *bhāvas* would seem to be beyond doubt, and the probabilities are that the first is *sattva*.

Having exhausted the meanings of *sattva* in texts suggestive of Sāṃkhya in the Mokṣadharma section of the epic, we may ask ourselves: can we find an "original" *sattva* from which the later functions of this concept can be naturally derived? A few considerations should precede our inquiry. First be it repeated that the evidence about *sattva*, as well as the facts about the relation between *rajas* and *tamas* for which we have tried to account in the above hypothesis, should warn us not to assume beforehand that, since *sattva* is principally known as the first of the three guṇas, it therefore has always been in a triad and we are to look for an ancient triad to fit it in. Actually we are reasonably sure only that *rajas* always belonged in a triad; *tamas* did not. Secondly the fact stands out that *sattva* especially when it occurs by itself mostly occurs in evolution doctrines which describe an individuation rather than a cosmogony. But having made this observation we are to remind ourselves immediately that the distinction, though useful, is far from being sharp. World creation was described as the individuation process of a cosmic being. This is probably the most significant fact on which we ought to test our ability to follow the associations from one set of myths about creation to another set of more sophisticated theories of evolution. Though we may glibly talk about macrocosmic and microcosmic aspects, this equivalence of the world at large and the world that is the person is difficult to understand; and even more difficult to operate with, for it is clear that just in the epoch with which we are dealing macrocosm and microcosm become separated somehow, but not so completely that many concepts do not remain ambivalent for a long time. In *rajas* we have a clear case where a macrocosmic entity looses its macrocosmic content almost entirely;[60] but not in all cases the distinctions are so clear-cut. Therefore if we say that *sattva* figures often in speculations where attention is not so much focused on cosmogony as on individuation, we cannot be sure we have made a meaningful statement; but more meaning may we gather from the fact that *sattva*, in the variety of its functions, frequently occurs there where the upward progress of return to the original state of person or original being is described rather than where the downward progress of creation is the sole topic.

possessed of *sattva* and in which there is no evil, is the *apahatapātman ātman* in the mystic lotus in the *brahmapura* of ChUp. 8, 1, 1 and this MaitrUp. text.

These observations may clear the way before we attempt an etymology of *sattva*. To render the term with "goodness" is to start from its moral function as the first of the guṇas which, as universal constituents, by their interplay and relative preponderance determine the phenomena of the world and the character of man. But we have seen that this *sattva* is historically the same as the *sattva* in other meanings, and this rendering of the term[61] would hardly account for such meanings as "sum-total of body and creation," which is a much wider notion. Moreover, as we pointed out in passing, this meaning of *sat* 'good' is not very satisfactory: it conveys "morally good" is so far as it denotes "strict and punctilious in doing one's duty, esp. in ritual detail." An abstraction of this *sat* would hardly be expected to figure prominently in the hierarchy of doctrines in circles which were definitely not characterized by their undue preoccupation with ritualistic exactitude. We should

[60] It exists on as "universal constituent" of *pradhāna*, which is not more than a rudiment of its original function.

[61] Nearest perhaps is sat in such passages as Tāṇḍya MBr. 15, 12, 2 *sad vai vāmadevyaṃ sāmnāṃ sad virāṭ chandasāṃ sat trayastriṃśaḥ stomānāṃ satām antān saṃdhyāyottiṣṭhanty api ha putrasya putraḥ sattvam aśnute*, where *sat* means "excellent" (Sāyaṇa: *utkṛṣṭa*), and *sattva* "excellence"; Böhtlingk-Roth render *sattva* here by "Wesen, Character," which is not so appropriate.

look for another *sat* which figures as an elevated principle in a creation or evolution account where the upward progress of yogic return is expressed or implied.

This *sat* is, I think, to be found in such texts as the celebrated Sadvidyā of Uddālaka, ChUp. 6,[62] where an original being called *sat*, by a process of tripartition, creates the phenomenal world which again returns to its source and is reabsorbed in it; this reabsorption means the release of the individual soul.[63] The Vedāntins, esp. the advaitins, have interpreted this *sat* as *sattāmātram* and many a translator has followed them; but it is clear that *sat* is an original creator with an *ātman* [64] to it, and that *sat* here means "the being which exist (here and now)."

We have seen that *sattva* can denote the body-complex, the aggregate of elements and psyche, of the *puruṣa* or *kṣetrajña*, "the embodied soul." In such contexts the totality of the body—which is creation at large—can be understood as the *sat-tva* of this soul, as the condition which makes this soul a *sat*, "an entity which exists concretely." [65] We may adduce here another meaning of *sattva*, not considered so far, which is very common: "living being, a being generally, but animate rather than inanimate." [66] Such concrete meanings of an "abstract" noun in *-tva* should warn us against interpreting *sattva* too abstractly. Renderings like "a being," or "*Wesen*" which runs like a scarlet thread through the many meanings distinguished by Böhtlingk-Roth, are deceptive: they presuppose an abstract "being, *Sein*," whereas *sattva* presupposes a concrete "existing thing." The habit of translating this *sat* itself as "Being," already in ṚV. 10, 129 is at best an error of anachronism.

Elsewhere the present writer has discussed this *sat* in some detail [67] and here his remarks will be confined to the following. In such hymns as ṚV. 10, 129 etc. *sat* is the product of *asat*, which might be rendered: "that which is not yet a *sat*," but not just "non-existent," let alone "Non-being." The emergence of *sat* out of *asat*, one might say, the reification of *asat*, takes place under the general supervision of a personal creator, though there is a tendency to dispense with his services. This emergence of *sat* out of *asat*, or *asat*'s becoming a *sat*, remains the current view till Uddālaka disposes of *asat* and has creation start with *sat* alone. But *sat* remains a being that fulfills itself in creation, and already in ṚV. 10, 129 we can talk of the *sattva* of *asat*. Uddālaka, while doing away with *asat*, is quite aware of his originality as his justification shows.[68] The problem, as I see it, was the ambivalence of *asat*: Uddālaka finds it impossible to derive from *asat* "non-existent" and *asatya* "not as it is and always has been and ought to be," "not fixed, permanent and true," a *sat* that is not only the all-comprehensive existent and persistent Original Being but also the *satya* [69] with all its associations. But *sat* and *asat* also formed another contrast. Instructive is a passage in BĀUp. 2, 3 where the *brahman* is said to have two forms, a solid and an unsolid one (*mūrta* and *amūrta*), which are *sat* "existing here, palpably" and *tyad* "the yon, existing beyond *sat*," compared in this text with the sun and the person within it. This *tyad*, or unsolid or transcending aspect of brahman is *satya*; where *sat* is the mortal, *tyad*

---

[62] Senart was, as far as I know, the only one who ever suggested such a connection; his suggestion was tentative and mainly inspired by his attempt to connect the guṇa *sattva* with the *tejas* of ChUp. 6.

[63] ChUp. 6, 8, 6.

[64] See below.

[65] It is tempting to explain *sattva* in Gopātha Br. 2, 4, 12 similarly: *prajāpatir etebhyaḥ prāṇebho 'nyān devān sasṛje / yad u cedaṃ kiṃ ca pāṅktaṃ tat sṛṣṭvā vyājvalayat / te hocur devā—mlāno 'yaṃ pitāmaho 'bhūt* (e.c. Gaastra) */ punar imaṃ samīryotthāpayāmeti / sa ha sattvam ākhyāyābhyupatiṣṭhate / yadi hi vā api nirṇiktasyaiva kulasya saṃdhyukṣeṇa yajate sattvam ākhyāyābhyupatiṣṭhate* "Prajāpati created the other gods out of these prāṇas; having created all these five he set them afire (sacrificed them); the old father had become exhausted (i. e. the fire had died down) [I transpose]; then the gods said: 'let us shake him up and revive him.' Having called on his *sattva* he rose again up to them. (Similarly) if someone sacrifices by kindling (*saṃdhukṣeṇa?*) a pile which is extinguished as (water) was sprinkled over it, (the fire) rises up again by calling on its *sattva*." The passage is far from clear nor its readings certain; but it would appear that *sattva* here represents the inner life-giving substance of *prajāpati* / sacrificial fire (identical: *yo vai prajāpatiḥ sa yajñaḥ*.

[66] *Sattva* 'thing' is attested very rarely.

[67] *Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha*, Intr. I.

[68] ChUp. 6, 2, 1-2 *tad dhaika āhuḥ—asad evedam agra āsīd ekam evādvitīyam / tasmād asataḥ sad ajāyateti / kutas tu khalu somyaivaṃ syād iti katham asataḥ saj jāyeta.*

[69] Cf. 6, 8, 6 *sa ātmā tat satyam.*

is the immortal. This unsolid, transcending entity is also called *asat*, which one would like to render with "unreified" rather than "unreal." The *sattva* of the *sat* here is just that it is an obviously existing, tangible, solid thing.

It is this *asat* which in a number of texts, and by Uddālaka's adversaries, was regarded as the first "cause." Faced with the problem how to derive from an *asat* 'non-existent and untrue' a *sat* creation, Uddālaka resolved it by simply doing away with *asat*. The authors of TaittUp. 2, faced with the same ambiguity of *asat*, solved it by equating it with *sat* in terms reminiscent both of ChUp. 6 and BĀUp. 2, 3. TaittUp. 2, 6-7 reads:

asann eva sa bhavati asad brahmeti veda cet /
asti brahmeti ced veda santam enaṃ tato viduḥ //

. . . so 'kāmayata / bahu syāṃ prajāyeyeti / sa tapo 'tapyata / sa tapas taptvā / idaṃ sarvam asṛjata / yad idaṃ kiṃ ca / tat sṛṣṭvā / tad evānuprāviśat / tad anupraviśya / sac ca tyac cābhavat / niruktaṃ cāniruktaṃ ca / nilayanaṃ cānilayanaṃ ca / satyaṃ cānṛtaṃ ca / satyam abhavat / yad idaṃ kiṃ ca / tat satyam ity ācakṣate / tad apy eṣa śloko bhavati /

asad vā idam agra āsīt tato vai sad ajāyata /
tad ātmānaṃ svayam akuruta tasmāt tat sukṛtam ucyate //

. . . yadā hy evaiṣa etasminn adṛśye 'nātmye 'nirukte 'nilayane 'bhayaṃ pratiṣṭhāṃ vindate / atha so 'bhayaṃ gato bhavati: "Non-existent shall one become, when one knows *brahman* for 'non-existent.' When one knows that *brahman* exists, then they know that one is existing." . . . "He wished: I will be many, I will beget. He heated himself up;[70] after having heated up himself, he discharged[71] all this, whatever there is. Having discharged it, he entered into it. Having entered into it, it became *sat* and *tyad*, formulated and unformulated, conscious and unconscious, solid and unsolid, real and unreal: it was real, whatever there is. That is why they say: "it is real."[72] On this there is this śloka: "The *asat* was here at first; from it arose the *sat*: it made itself a person; therefore it is said to be well-done."[73] . . . When one finds oneself security, a firm foothold on this invisible,[74] unpersonified, unformulated, unsolidified (*asat*), then indeed one will have reached complete security." Here we have the two meanings of *asat*: "non-existent," the opposite of *asti*, in the first śloka, and "unreified" in the second śloka. In the creation account of the prose commentary the masculine *saḥ* refers to *ātman* or *prajāpati*, and the same original being is referred to as a neuter in *sac ca tyac cābhavat* etc. *Tyad, aniruktam, avijñānam, anilayanam* and *anṛtam* (*asatyam*)[75] explain the *asat* of the following śloka. The created world is something real, reified, *satya*. Here again we see how the creator becomes a *sat* when he has entered into his creation, i. e. reified himself. In the śloka the same view is repeated: from the *asat* the *sat* originated, it (*asat*) personified himself; for *asat* is *anātmya* "not (yet) a being with an *ātman* to it, not personified."

In the earliest occurrences of the term *sat* appears as a more or less technical term for the manifest creation that emerges from the unmanifest under the aegis of a personal creator who is really the *asat* reifying himself. *Sat* thus is the first created product, it is the whole of creation; but it is also the prime cause of creation for it is the being that has reified itself in creation. But very early already we see that the "personal creator" is separated from this *asat* becoming *sat*, though not everywhere. It would seem that where the notion of an original creator behind *sat* persisted, *sat* was the created, creation; there where the personality vanishes, a process that starts in ṚV. 10, 129 and is completed in ChUp. 6, sat was the self-created creator. It would seem that *sattva*, undoubtedly a notion that was elaborated in circles where the idea of a personality—with increasingly microcosmic features—persisted, reflects in its functions the aspect of *sat* as the

---

[70] This *tapas* corresponds to the *tejas* of ChUp. 6 and the *tapas* of BĀUp. 1, 2 discussed above.

[71] *Sṛj-*.

[72] E. g. Uddālaka ChUp. 6. 8. 6 *sa ātmā tat satyam*, where *ātman* and *satya* both denote the reified original being.

[73] *Sukṛtam*; one could render "well-finished, completed."

[74] Cf. the invisible person (*tyad*) in the visible sun (*sat*) in BĀUp. 2, 3.

[75] Another description is *avyaktam* which, originally synonymous with *asat*, came to denote on the one hand the transcendent *ātman*, on the other hand the primordial matter, *pradhāna*, to which the creator's function of the *ātman* were delegated.

reified and created. As such it could easily become linked up with tripartite creation, for as we have seen the triadic pattern was very frequently used in creation accounts: *sat* of ChUp. 6 itself creates itself in the three stages of *tejas, āpas* and *annam* and then personifies itself by entering into these three entities as a living being.[76] But *sat* was not necessarily involved in triads, and we see *sattva* exist outside such groupings. As the first created creature *sat* was here and there approximated to the *buddhi,* which originally was the self-recognition of the original being as a person, an *ātmanvin,* and *sattva,* the "createdness" of this being, could become the state of this self-recognition or *buddhi. Sattva* thus lost some of its autonomy to *buddhi,* but preserved it in other circles where it could still sum up the entire creation or, microcosmically, the *puruṣa's* body. *Sattva* not only had its own ambivalence from *sat* which was both creator and created, but when linked up with *buddhi* came to share a corresponding ambivalence of this "self-recognition": the FINAL liberating self-recognition on the one hand, and on the other hand the INITIAL creative self-recognition, which gradually, with the increasing primacy of the transcendent and unmanifest as the unalterable "truth," became a mistaking oneself for creation, a misconception;[77] this function, with the function of creator at the bottom of it, was also transferred to another originally equivalent[78] entity called *ahaṃkāra.* So *sattva* could be either tantamount to release, the *buddhi's* self-revelatory insight, or the first step out of and the last step before a state of release. In the latter function it could describe a person's CAPACITY OF RELEASE, as I think, we find it in *sthirasattva, mahāsattva, alpasattva* etc. It would seem probable that *bodhisattva* belongs to this *sattva*: it describes a personality that has reached the last step before reaching the redeeming knowledge and can have this knowledge at will. Probably also the *sattva* of ChUp. 7, 26, 2 and MaitrUp. 4, 3, where this capacity of release, purified by *tapas,* precedes *smṛti* or *manas,* in which we may very well have synonyms of *buddhi.*

It is not clear how *sattva* came to be associated just with *rajas* and *tamas.* Probably it succeeded to a principle like *tapas* or *jyotis,* which acquired the connotation of "light of knowledge" and had its opposite in "darkness" and "obscuration." It is very likely that *rajas* 'atmosphere' brought the triadic pattern along; where *rajas* does not occur we find no clear triads, though both *sattva* and *tamas* have definite potentialities to be involved in groupings of three. However that may be, once the three were united in a triad they were all but inseparable, and no more than hints survive of independent functions of *sattva* and *tamas.*[79] They were so united at an early date; there is no reason to doubt that the three guṇas of AthV. 10, 8, 43 refer to the precursors of *sattva, rajas* and *tamas*;[80] and the speculations about the mystic

[76] It is clear that *ātman* in .. *anupraviśya jivenātmanā* is the *sat* now personified; cf. my remarks in *Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha,* Intr. I.

[77] *Abhimāna,* which originally is presumably the same as the *abhimāna* of BĀUp. 1, 2, 4: *sa aikṣata—yadi vā imam abhimaṃsye kanīyo 'nnaṃ kariṣya iti,* where *imam* is the original being's "second self," i. e. personification.

[78] Self-recognition and self-formulation being the same process.

[79] For all the attention we have here given these autonomous functions of *sattva* and *tamas,* it is plain that they are in a very small minority as compared with their function as members of the guṇa triad.

[80] There is no evidence to show that they were really called *sattva, rajas* and *tamas.* Personally I should be inclined to think that *sattva* came to occupy the first place in a triad of which *rajas* was the second term and succeeded there to a first term *jyotis* or *tapas* or *tejas.* We see for instance *jyotis* appear in a triad in statu nascendi with *rajas* and *tamas,* AthV. 8, 2, 1-2 *á rabhasvemām amṛtasya śnúṣṭim ácchidyamānā jarádaṣṭir astu te / ásuṃ ta ā́yuḥ púnar ā́ bharāmi rájas támo mópa gā mā́ prá meṣṭhāḥ // jīvatā́ṃ jyótir abhy ehi arvā́ṅ ā́ tvā harāmi śatáśaradāya / avamuñcán mṛtyupāśā́n áśastiṃ drā́ghīyo ā́yuḥ pratarā́ṃ te dadāmi.* Whitney-Lanman translate: "take thou hold of this bundle (?) of immortality; unsevered length of time be thine; I bring back thy life, thy life-time; go not to the welkin (*rájas*), the darkness. Come hitherward unto the light of the living; I take thou in order to live for a hundred autumns; loosening down the fetters of death, imprecation, I set for thee further a longer life-time." As the translators remark: "it is indeed a little startling to find the two names (sc. *rajas* and *tamas*) here side by side." Whether *rajas* has the meaning of "welkin" or "blackness of dirt" etc., the triad is still a dyad and the whole situation is neatly comparable to *tapas/sattva* ↔ *tamas/rajas-tamas* of MBh. 12, 209, 10, supra. In the opposition *jyotis* ↔ *rajas-tamas* is doubtless also reflected that of the two paths of light and darkness (ChUp. 5, 10, 1; BhG. 8, 26) which here find a worldly application.

lotus—with which *sattva* was also associated—show that the date of this passage cannot be removed too far from comparable speculations in the earliest upaniṣads.[81]

[81] In an Appendix to her *Il mito psicologico nell' India antica* (Memoria della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1939, serie vi, volume viii, fascicolo v), Maryla Falk has discussed the origins of the guṇas ("Genesi della dottrina dei tre guṇa," appendice II, p. 415/703 ff.) particularly in relation to AthV. 10, 8, 43 etc. and ChUp. 6. Her views on the origin of the triad as a triad are too closely connected with her general hypothesis on the origin of the yogic puruṣa doctrine, which she traces back to the oldest texts, to be easily made intelligible out of context. In AthV. and ChUp. texts the three guṇas which surround the *puṇḍarīka* are "il luminoso fluido dello hṛdākāśa con i suoi tre colori principali (corrispondenti alle tre sedi del cuore), entre cui, secondo la concezione spesso documentata nelle Upaniṣad, è contenuto potenzialmente l'ātman." With the last remark I agree to the extent that the Creator, as we have seen, reifies and personifies himself in three cosmic stages — worlds / seasons — which, with the increasing "microcosmification" of the creation process, with all its soteric implications, come to lend their pattern to different forms of psychological life. I cannot enter here into a discussion of her arguments which are in part answered in this and former studies and in part outside the scope of the present study which, apart from describing the general background of cosmogonic triads, concerned itself mainly with the individual histories of the three terms. Miss Falk's book, stimulating for all the opposition it evokes, was not available to me in India where this article was written and could not be given the consideration which it has rarely found but richly deserves.

CĀṆAKYA'S APHORISMS IN THE HITOPADEŚA (III) *

LUDWIK STERNBACH

NEW YORK

4. VIRTUE AND VICE

No. 53

Tribhir varṣais tribhir māsais tribhiḥ pakṣais tribhir dinaiḥ
[1] *aty-utakṭaiḥ pāpa-puṇyair* [2] *ihaiva phalam aśnute* [3]

Within three years, within three months, within three fortnights, [or] within three days, one reaps, even here, the fruit of extraordinary vices or virtues.

HJ 1.85, HS 1.78, HM 1.82, HP 1.60, HN 1.61, HK 1.84, HH 19.17-8, HC 26.16-7, IS 2642; *CVT*(b) 12.3, *CVT*(c) 7.37, *CVT*(e) 63; PrC 4.211.
The main editions of H contain some minor variants. PrC contains some minor variants.

Footnotes to No. 53: [1] *aty-ugrapuṇya* HP, PrC; *aty-utkaṭaiḥ puṇya pāpaiḥ* N in HP [2] *pāpānām* HP, PrC; *puṇya-pāpair* HN [3] *ucyate* Pp in HS

No. 54

[1] *Na sthātavyaṁ na gantavyaṁ kṣaṇam* [2] *apy asatā* [3] *saha*
[4] *asatāṁ saṁgamo mṛtyuḥ satāṁ saṁgo hi bheṣajam* [5]

One ought not live together or walk even for a moment with a wicked man. Relationship with a wicked [person] is death; association with a good [person] medicine.

HH 74.26-7, IS 3499; *CLB* 1.43 (cf. HJ 3.23a and IS 3498).
The main editions of H are identical. *C* is identical in *aβ* only; that part contains minor variants.

Footnotes to No. 54: [1] *nā'sthā°* IS [2] *kṣaṇāṁ CLB* [3] *asatāṁ* IS; *adhamaiḥ CLB* [4] *payo'pi śauṇḍinīhaste* (*śoṇḍinī°* IS; *śodinī° CLB* var.; *sau°* IS) *madirāṁ manyate janaḥ CLB* [5] *vāruṇīty abhidhīyate* IS

No. 55

Tyaja durjana-saṁsargaṁ bhaja sādhu-samāgamam
kuru puṇyam aho-rātraṁ smara nityam anityatām [1]

Forsake the society of the wicked. Cultivate the society of the good. Practise virtue day and night. Remember always [your] transitory state.

HJ 3.24; HH 77.20-1, IS 2621; *CVND* 14.20, *CVV* 14.20, *CV* in IS (2621) 14.20, *CVB* (IS 2621) 100, *CVA* 6.16, *CVF* 6.17, *CVG* 6.16, *CVN* 6.18; *CVT*(a) 24; *CVT*(b) 9.4, *CVT*(c) 6.12, *CVT*(d) 130, *CVT*(e) 42, *CVT*(f) 102, *CVW* 6.16; *CLB* 1.57; *CRC* 2.12, *CRB* 2.12; *CŚlB* 140; GP 1.108.26; BhŚ 519.

* See *JAOS*, LXXVI, pp. 115-130, and LXXVII, pp. 26-31.